

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-13 and 16-20 are currently pending.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,314,108 to Ramasubramani et al. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13 and to clarify the claimed invention and to obviate the rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the apparatus is a proxy that operates as a part of the network. In addition, claim 1 is amended to define the persistent connection. Claim 13 is amended to indicate the request is received from a client device. Applicants have previously described the claims and Ramasubramani, and those statements and arguments stating that the claims are patentable over Ramasubramani are repeated and incorporated here.

Applicants' amendments clarify what a persistent connection is. A "persistent connection" is a connection that is maintained as active so that communications or requests can be forwarded over these connections without having to establish new connections and without having to go through a set-up process between devices, e.g. the claimed proxy and server. Applicants' claims are directed to a persistent connection between the proxy on the network and the server that supplies data to a user. Applicants claim amendments to claim 1 and 13, which is consistent with the format of claim 8, clarify that the persistent connection is with the server and not with the user, wireless communication device or client device.

In the Final Office Action and the Advisory Action, carrier networks 208-212 and wireless communication devices 202-206 are cited. In addition, networks 202 and 602 are cited. As previously stated, these connections are between the wireless communication device or client device and the network and do not focus on the connections between the proxy and the servers. The proxy is equated to the network gateway 202, 602, which connect to the servers 218 and 220 through Internet 216. Applicants' claims focus on these connections not the connections from the wireless communication devices or client devices into the proxy and the Internet. The Internet is

not specifically known for having persistent connections, i.e. active connections, with servers. Moreover, Ramasubramani does not state that these connections are persistent connections. Therefore, there is nothing in Ramasubramani to suggest that the connections are not needed to be created between the proxy and the server each time a wireless connection device or client device requests access to the server.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Ramasubramani does not disclose the claimed apparatus, system and method that focuses on the persistent connections between the proxy and the one or more servers on which requested objects are. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8 and 13 are not anticipated by Ramasubramani. As claims 2, 4-5 and 7 depend on claim 1, claims 9 and 11-12 depend on claim 8 and claims 16-20 depend on claim 13, Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference for the same reasons. Applicants request that the rejection under Section 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani in view of United States Patent No. 7,167,926 to Boucher et al. Claims 3 and 6 depend on claim 1 and claim 10 depends on claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit the dependent claims are patentable over the cited combination as neither Ramasubramani nor Boucher are directed to the persistent connections between the proxy and the servers on which objects are for the reasons given above with respect to the rejection under Section 102(b). Applicants request that the rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Serial No.10/840,053  
Bedekar et al  
Case No. CE10624R

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to  
**50-2117.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Bedekar, Anand S., et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 37,585  
Telephone: 847-576-4234  
Fax: 847-576-3750